

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,079 09/04/2001		/04/2001	Atsushi Suzuki	213502US0	1164
22850	7590	03/07/2002			
OBLON SP	IVAK MC	CLELLAND M	EXAMINER		
FOURTH FL 1755 JEFFER		'IS HIGHWAY	COE, SUSAN D		
ARLINGTON, VA 22202				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1651	
				DATE MAILED: 03/07/2002	7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s))				
Office Action Summary		09/944,079	SUZUKI ET	AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Susan Coe	1651					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTOR THE MAILING DATE OF THI - Extensions of time may be available ur after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing - If the period for reply specified above is - If NO period for reply is specified above - Failure to reply within the set or extend - Any reply received by the Office later the earned patent term adjustment. See 37	S COMMUNICATION. der the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 date of this communication. less than thirty (30) days, a repl et, the maximum statutory period ded period for reply will, by statute an three months after the mailing	36(a). In no event, however, y within the statutory minimur will apply and will expire SIX is, cause the application to be	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considere (6) MONTHS from the mailing date o come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 13	f this communication.				
	nication(s) filed on 19 i	February 2002 .						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .		nis action is non-final						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pen								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are a								
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6</u> is/are rejecte								
7) Claim(s) is/are o								
8) Claim(s) are sub Application Papers	ject to restriction and/o	r election requiremen	nt.					
9) The specification is obje	cted to by the Evamine	ar.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on _	•		o by the Examiner					
•			abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.8	35(a).				
11) The proposed drawing c	• •							
	awings are required in re							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119	and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is ma	de of a claim for foreigr	n priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□	None of:							
1.⊠ Certified copies of	f the priority document	s have been receive	d.					
2. Certified copies of								
application from								
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made	e of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U	.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provis	sional application).				
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.								
Attachment(s)			JU					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-8 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s	wing Review (PTO-948)	5) No	erview Summary (PTO-413) Pap tice of Informal Patent Applicatio er:					

Application/Control Number: 09/944,079 Page 2

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 are currently pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II, claim 6, chlorogenic acid for species A, and organic acid having a molecular weight of 60 to 300 for species B in Paper No. 6, dated February 19, 2002 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that support has not been shown that fiber can be used to lower cholesterol. This is not found persuasive because MPEP section 806.05 (h) states:

The burden is on the examiner to provide an example, but the example need not be documented.

If the applicant either proves or provides a convincing argument that the alternative use suggested by the examiner cannot be accomplished, the burden is on the examiner to support a viable alternative use or withdraw the requirement.

In this case, applicant has not argued why food fiber cannot be used to lower cholesterol.

Therefore, this basis for the restriction requirement is considered valid. In addition, this use of fiber is known in the art.

Applicant also argues a search of both groups would not place a burden on the examiner because both groups are classified in the same class and subclass. However, while the search of both groups might overlap to some extent, they are not necessarily coextensive especially in regards to the literature search that is necessary in a case of this sort.

Applicant argues that the election of species requirement is improper because the examiner has not provided reasons for holding that the species are patentably distinct. However,

Application/Control Number: 09/944,079 Page 3

Art Unit: 1651

this is not a requirement when making an election of species requirement based on a burdensome number of species (see MPEP section 803.02).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

3. Claims 1-5 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 6.

4. Claim 6 is examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim is rendered indefinite by the use of parentheses in line 12. The use of parentheses is considered indefinite because it cannot be determined when the enclosed limitation is or is not to be included in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in

Application/Control Number: 09/944,079

Art Unit: 1651

section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).
- 6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0022062 A1 (filing date July 11, 2001).

Applicant's claim 6 is drawn to a method of treating hypertension using chlorogenic acid and organic acids having a molecular weight of 60 to 300.

US '062 teaches a method treating hypertension using a coffee extract and vitamin C (see paragraphs [0045] and [0046]). The coffee extract contains chlorogenic acid (see paragraph [0014]). Vitamin C is an organic acid with a molecular weight of 176.

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat. No. 5,958,417 and US Pat. No. 4,434,177.

Application/Control Number: 09/944,079 Page 5

Art Unit: 1651

US '417 teaches that the plant Crataegus is used to treat hypertension. An active component in Crataegus is chlorogenic acid (see column 2, lines 55-63).

US '177 teaches using ascorbic acid to treat hypertension (see claims). Ascorbic acid is an organic acid with a molecular weight of 176.

These references show that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to use chlorogenic acid and an organic acid to treat hypertension. It is well known that it is prima facie obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. In re Pinten, 459 F.2d 1053, 173 USPQ 801 (CCPA 1972); In re Susi, 58 CCPA 1074, 1079-80; 440 F.2d 442, 445; 169 USPQ 423, 426 (1971); In re Crockett, 47 CCPA 1018, 1020-21; 279 F.2d 274, 276-277; 126 USPQ 186, 188 (1960).

Based on the disclosure by these references that these substances are used to treat hypertension, an artisan of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation that a combination of the two substances would also be useful in treating hypertension. Therefore, the artisan would have been motivated to combine chlorogenic acid and an organic acid together to treat hypertension. No patentable invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients. See In re Sussman, 1943 C.D. 518; In re Huellmantel 139 USPQ 496; In re Crockett 126 USPQ 186.

8. No claims are allowed.

Application/Control Number: 09/944,079

Art Unit: 1651

Page 6

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Coe whose telephone number is (703) 306-5823. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 8:00 to 5:30 and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn, can be reached on (703) 308-4743. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

SDC March 5, 2002